



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,962	12/15/2003	Mark Anthony Howard	D/A 3284	3390
41461	7590	06/06/2006	EXAMINER	
CHARLES A. RATTNER 12 HOMEWOOD LANE DARRIEN, CT 06820-6109			RAYYAN, SUSAN F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2167	

DATE MAILED: 06/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/735,962	HOWARD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Susan F. Rayyan	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 December 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1,3-7,13-14,19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0046232 issued to Colin John Adams ("Adams") in view of US Patent Application Publication Number 2004/018487 issued to Eric A. Hanson ("Hanson").

As per claim 1, Adams teaches a method for fulfilling a file-sharing query (abstract), comprising:

providing a user interface (UI) to a querying user, the UI for entering a query to a metadata repository (see paragraph 18-19, Adams' central index server is taught in a manner similar to the claimed metadata repository) ;

receiving a query from the querying user via the UI, the shared file satisfying the query based on the stored metadata (paragraph 19);

and transmitting an identification of the shared file to the querying user(paragraph 20).

Adams does not explicitly teach transmitting a client-side application to a file-sharing user having a shared file, the client-side application for generating metadata corresponding to the shared file and receiving and storing the metadata from the file-sharing user. Hanson does teach transmitting a client-side application to a file-sharing user having a shared file, the client-side application for generating metadata corresponding to the shared file and receiving and storing the metadata from the file-sharing user (paragraph 47, paragraph 65, lines 1-5) to reduce distribution costs, facilitate distribution of content and ensure content owners receive benefits (see summary). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams with transmitting a client-side application to a file-sharing user having a shared file, the client-side application for generating metadata corresponding to the shared file and receiving and storing the metadata from the file-sharing user to reduce distribution costs, facilitate distribution of content and ensure

content owners receive benefits (see summary).

As per claim 3, same as claim arguments above and Adams teaches:

The method of claim 1, said client-side application generating the metadata using an abstracting program (paragraph 49).

As per claim 4, same as claim arguments above and Adams teaches:

The method of claim 1, said UI comprising a proprietary UI of the metadata repository (paragraph 18-19).

As per claim 5, same as claim arguments above and Adams teaches:

The method of claim 1, said transmitting an identification further comprising:
transmitting a hyperlink to the querying user in response to the query, wherein a selection of the hyperlink by the querying user initiates a transmission of the shared file from the file-sharing user to the querying user (paragraph 15, line . 21-23).

As per claim 6, same as claim arguments above and Adams teaches:

The method of claim 1, further comprising: storing the shared file locally based on a characteristic of the shared file (paragraph 52).

As per claim 7, same as claim arguments above and Adams teaches:

The method of claim 6, said transmitting an identification further comprising:
transmitting a hyperlink to the querying user in response to the query, wherein a selection of the hyperlink by the querying user initiates a transmission of the shared file from the metadata repository to the querying user (paragraph 15, lines 21-23 and paragraph 21-23).

As per claim 13, same as claim arguments above and Hanson teaches:

The method of claim 1, further comprising: providing a payment to the file-sharing user for the shared file transmitted to the querying user (paragraph 65).

As per claim 14, same as claim arguments above and Hanson teaches:

The method of claim 13, further comprising: receiving a payment from the querying user for the shared file (paragraph 65).

As per claim 19 Adams teaches:

receiving a query from a user in the searching class, the metadata satisfying the query (paragraphs 18-19);

and providing an identification of the shared file to the user in the searching class (paragraph 20).

Adams does not explicitly teach establishing at least two classes of users that interact with a metadata repository over a network, the at least two classes including a sharing class that primarily provides data and a searching class that primarily searches for data and receiving metadata identifying a shared file from a user in the sharing class. Hanson does teach establishing at least two classes of users that interact with a

Art Unit: 2167

metadata repository over a network, the at least two classes including a sharing class that primarily provides data (paragraph 65, selling side) and a searching class that primarily searches for data (paragraph 40, user a);

receiving metadata identifying a shared file from a user in the sharing class (paragraphs 47,65) to reduce distribution costs, facilitate distribution of content and ensure content owners receive benefits (see summary). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams with establishing at least two classes of users that interact with a metadata repository over a network, the at least two classes including a sharing class that primarily provides data, a searching class that primarily searches for data, and receiving metadata identifying a shared file from a user in the sharing class to reduce distribution costs, facilitate distribution of content and ensure content owners receive benefits (see summary).

As per claim 20, same as claim arguments above and Adams teaches:

The method of claim 19, further comprising: uploading the shared file from the user in the sharing class for distribution to users in the searching class when the shared file satisfies a predetermined condition (paragraphs 21-23) .

Claims 2,9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0046232 issued to Colin John Adams (“Adams”) in view of US Patent Application Publication Number 2004/018487 issued to Eric A. Hanson (“Hanson”) and further in view of US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0143976 issued to Reed A. Barker et al (“Barker”).

As per claim 2, same as claim arguments above and Adams and Hanson do not explicitly teach periodically receiving and storing updated metadata from the client-side application. Barker does teach periodically receiving and storing updated metadata from the client-side application (paragraph 28) to allow a content provider to manage metadata locally and to maintain control over editing of metadata (paragraph 7, lines 1-3).

As per claim 9, same as claim arguments above and Adams and Hanson do not explicitly teach wherein the metadata is transmitted to at least one other metadata repository for storage and the shared file is not transmitted to any other metadata repository for storage.

Barker does teach explicitly teach wherein the metadata is transmitted to at least one other metadata repository for storage and the shared file is not transmitted to any other metadata repository for storage (paragraphs 8,28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Adams and Hanson with wherein the metadata is transmitted to at least one other metadata repository for storage and the shared file is not transmitted to any other metadata repository for storage to allow a content provider to manage metadata locally and to maintain control over editing of metadata (paragraph

7, lines 1-3).

As per claim 10, same as claim arguments above and Adams and Hanson do not explicitly teach receiving updated metadata for storage and transmitting the updated metadata to at least one other associated metadata repository to facilitate queries directed to the at least one other associated metadata repository.

Barker does teach receiving updated metadata for storage and transmitting the updated metadata to at least one other associated metadata repository to facilitate queries directed to the at least one other associated metadata repository (paragraph 28) to allow a content provider to manage metadata locally and to maintain control over editing of metadata (paragraph 7, lines 1-3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Adams and Hanson with receiving updated metadata for storage and transmitting the updated metadata to at least one other associated metadata repository to facilitate queries directed to the at least one other associated metadata repository to allow a content provider to manage metadata locally and to maintain control over editing of metadata (paragraph 7, lines 1-3).

As per claim 11, same as claim arguments above and Barker teaches:

The method of claim 10, said transmitting the updated metadata further comprising: transmitting the updated metadata in a parallel, pair wise protocol with the at least one other metadata repository (paragraph 8).

Claims 8, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0046232 issued to Colin John Adams ("Adams") in view of US Patent Application Publication Number 2004/018487 issued to Eric A. Hanson ("Hanson") and further in view of US Patent Application Publication Number 2006/0015574 issued to Steven L. Seed et al ("Seed").

As per claim 8, same as claim arguments above and Adams and Hanson do not explicitly teach the characteristic comprising a threshold popularity of the shared file. Seed does teach the characteristic comprising a threshold popularity of the shared file (paragraph 44) to reduce network congestion (paragraph 10, lines 20-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams and Hanson with the characteristic comprising a threshold popularity of the shared file to reduce network congestion (paragraph 10, lines 20-21).

Claims 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0046232 issued to Colin John Adams (“Adams”) in view of US Patent Application Publication Number 2004/018487 issued to Eric A. Hanson (“Hanson”) and further in view US Patent Application Publication 2003/0217152 issued to David J. Kasper II (“Kasper”).

As per claim 12, same as claim arguments above and Adams and Hanson do not explicitly teach periodically receiving updated metadata from a second metadata repository . Kasper does teach periodically receiving updated metadata from a second metadata repository (paragraphs 20-21, 48-50) to update local databases (paragraph 24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams and Hanson with periodically receiving updated metadata from a second metadata repository to update local databases (paragraph 24).

Claims 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0046232 issued to Colin John Adams (“Adams”) in view of US Patent Application Publication Number 2004/018487 issued to Eric A. Hanson (“Hanson”) and further in view of US Patent Application Publication Number 2006/0015574 issued to Steven L. Seed et al (“Seed”) and further in view of US Patent Application Publication 2003/0217152 issued to David J. Kasper II (“Kasper”).

As per claim 15 Adams teaches:

A method for facilitating file-sharing queries (see abstract), comprising:
storing the metadata locally at a first metadata repository to facilitate search queries from querying users received by the first metadata repository (paragraph 20, central index).

Adams does not explicitly teach receiving metadata files from a plurality of file-sharing users, the metadata files corresponding to shared files. Hanson does teach receiving metadata files from a plurality of file-sharing users, the metadata files corresponding to shared files (paragraph 47 and paragraph 65, lines 1-5) to reduce distribution costs, facilitate distribution of content and ensure content owners receive benefits (see summary). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams with receiving metadata files from a plurality of file-sharing users, the metadata files corresponding to shared files to reduce distribution costs, facilitate distribution of content and ensure content owners receive benefits (see summary).

Adams and Hanson do not explicitly teach uploading a shared file from a file-sharing user for local storage on a metadata repository when a plurality of search requests for the shared file exceed a predetermined threshold and periodically synchronizing stored metadata with a second metadata repository for facilitating queries from querying users received by the first and second metadata repositories. Seed does teach uploading a shared file from a file-sharing user for local storage on a metadata repository when a plurality of search requests for the shared file exceed a predetermined threshold (paragraph 44, lines 1-4 to reduce network congestion (paragraph 10, lines 20-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams and Hanson with uploading a shared file from a file-sharing user for local storage on a metadata repository when a plurality of search requests for the shared file exceed a predetermined threshold to reduce network congestion (paragraph 10, lines 20-21).

Adams, Hanson and Seed do not explicitly teach periodically synchronizing stored metadata with a second metadata repository for facilitating queries from querying users received by the first and second metadata repositories. Kasper does teach periodically synchronizing stored metadata with a second metadata repository for facilitating queries from querying users received by the first and second metadata repositories (paragraphs 20-21, 48-50) to update local databases from master databases (paragraph 24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adams Hanson and Seed with periodically synchronizing stored metadata with a second metadata repository for facilitating queries

Art Unit: 2167

from querying users received by the first and second metadata repositories) to update local databases from master databases (paragraph 24).

As per claim 16, same as claim arguments above and Adams teaches:

The method of claim 15, wherein the queries received by the metadata repository are not transmitted to the second metadata repository and queries received by the second metadata repository are not transmitted to the first metadata repository (paragraph 19-19).

As per claim 17, same as claim arguments above and Hanson teaches:

transmitting a client-side application to a file-sharing user having the shared file, the client-side application for generating metadata corresponding to the shared file(paragraph 47, paragraph 65, lines 1-5).

As per claim 18, same as claim arguments above and Adams teaches:

receiving a query from a querying user and transmitting an identification of a shared file satisfying the query to the querying user (paragraphs 19-20).

Contact Information

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Rayyan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1675. The examiner can normally be reached M-F: 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Susan Rayyan

May 30, 2006


JOHN R. COTTINGHAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER